

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 are pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 12 are independent. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2698191 to DeBuisser *et al.* (hereinafter “DeBuisser”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0000666 to [Wood] *et al.* (hereinafter “Wood”). (Please note that the Examiner states that Hou et al. are the inventors of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0000666 in the Office Action. As shown on the face of the U.S. Patent Application Publication for 2001/0000666, Wood et al. are the inventors.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, that DeBuisser substantially teaches Applicant’s invention, but DeBuisser does not teach a dedicated transmitter for position and a dedicated transmitter for the pressure signal. The Examiner also states that in DeBuisser, both transmitters 12, 14 are used for handling both pressure and position. Applicant respectfully agrees that both transmitters in DeBuisser are used for handling both pressure and position.

The Examiner further states on page 3 of the Office Action, that [Wood] teaches a second transmitter for pressure handling and another transmitter for position handling. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Wood does not solve the deficiencies of DeBuisser. In fact, the sections of Wood cited by the Examiner do not indicate Applicant's elements of: "an ultrasonic transmitter to transmit pulses for position determination" and "a second transmitter to transmit the pressure signal." Instead, Wood also teaches that both first and second signals (the first signal preferably from an infrared transducer and the second signal preferably from an ultrasonic transducer) are used to determine the location of the pointing tip of the transmitter pen. In para. [0010] of Wood, it states:

The location of the pointing tip of the transmitter pen is then determined, by using the first signal as a boundary condition, comparing the second signal to one or more stored prior second signals to determine the time of arrival of the second signal at each of the receivers, determining the distance from the pen to each of the receivers using the arrival time of the second signal compared to the arrival time of the first output signal, and then calculating a location for the pen which is consistent with the calculated distance to each of the external receivers.

Wood, page 2, para. [0010], pub. Date May 3, 2001.

Although Wood uses the first signal as a boundary condition, and compares the second signal to one or more prior stored second signals to determine the time of arrival of the second signal, Wood also teaches using the first signal to determine the distance from the pen to each of the receivers by using the arrival time of the second signal compared to the arrival time of the first output signal. Therefore, both Wood and DeBuisser use both transmitters to determine location. None of the sections cited by the Examiner state that Wood teaches "a second transmitter to transmit the pressure signal."

See also, Wood, para. [0006] which teaches an acoustic transmitter for triangulating the position of the stylus on the surface and a wireless transmitter for transmitting data and timing information to the computer; *see also, Wood*, page 3, para. [0037]; page 4, paras. [0054] and [0055]; and *Wood*, claims 1, 7-10, 16, 24, 31-34, 40, 48, 54-57, 63, 71, 77-80, 88. Contrary to the present invention, *Wood* does not teach or suggest transmitting a pressure signal.

Thus, neither DeBuisser nor *Wood*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-11) are patentable over the cited references of DeBuisser and *Wood*. Independent claim 12 recites similar elements to those of claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 13-17), are also patentable over the cited references of DeBuisser and *Wood*. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 12, and the claims that depend therefrom.

The Examiner, on pages 5-7 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0000666 to [Wood] *et al.* (hereinafter "*Wood*") in view of International Publication Number WO 00/73976 to Gerpheide. (Please note that the Examiner states that Hou *et al.* are the inventors of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0000666 in the Office Action. As shown on the face of the U.S. Patent Application Publication for 2001/0000666, *Wood et al.* are the inventors.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Based

on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 12, the Examiner states that Wood substantially teaches Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Wood does not teach or suggest at least the following element of: "... the ultrasonic pen being configured to transmit the pressure signal to the higher frequency receiver, and to transmit ultrasonic energy to the first and second ultrasonic receivers." As indicated above, unlike the present invention, Wood does not teach or suggest transmitting a pressure signal.

The Examiner further states that Wood does not teach a "digital signature" in the sense of the claim, but that Gerpheide teaches digital signatures. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Gerpheide does not solve the deficiencies of Wood. Gerpheide does not teach or suggest at least the element of "... the ultrasonic pen being configured to transmit the pressure signal to the higher frequency receiver, and to transmit ultrasonic energy to the first and second ultrasonic receivers."

Thus, neither Wood nor Gerpheide, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in claim 12. For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 13-17) are patentable over the cited references of Wood and Gerpheide. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 986-3179

Dated: May 8, 2006

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026